

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/059,057	01/30/2002	William B. Reulein	72225 (7423)	4143
22242	7590	04/04/2005	EXAMINER	
FITCH EVEN TABIN AND FLANNERY 120 SOUTH LA SALLE STREET SUITE 1600 CHICAGO, IL 60603-3406			ROSWELL, MICHAEL	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2173	

DATE MAILED: 04/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/059,057		REULEIN ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Michael Roswell		2173	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 December 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All. b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-7, 11-12, 17-21, 24-25, and 30-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Khan et al (US Patent 6,360,236), hereinafter Khan.

Regarding claims 1, 17, and 30, Khan teaches an interface for integrated document development, through a method and computer code means, that includes an ordering unit allowing users to place document orders (taught as the use of a project list region allowing a user to access files, at col. 6, lines 6-8), an authoring unit allowing users to create new document components and edit existing components (taught as the use of tools found in a tool palette allowing users to make changes to a document by adding, deleting, or modifying components, at col. 7, lines 29-62), an administration unit allowing users to selectively administer document assembly (taught as the display of a document in a display region, in one of many supported formats, at col. 6, lines 31-56), a searching unit allowing users to search for components, documents, and archival published documents (taught as the use of a project file directory allowing a user to view documents and components related to a project, at col. 6, lines 1-5), and a reporting unit allowing users to receive system reports (taught as the use of message files corresponding to project documents, at col. 6, lines 58-66).

Regarding claims 2, 18, and 31, Khan teaches an interactive publisher allowing a user to place document orders interactively, taught as the use of a project list region allowing a user to

Art Unit: 2173

access files, at col. 6, lines 6-8, and a secure ordering interface for allowing user access to selectively controlled individual functions, taught as the use of a user name and password for granting users access privileges to different projects, at col. 5, lines 13-19 and 64-66.

Regarding claims 3, 19, and 32, Khan teaches an interactive publisher listing variable data required to complete a document order (the file directory of col. 6, lines 1-5), receiving variable data from users responsive to the lists (taught as allowing users to make changes to a document by adding, deleting, or modifying components, at col. 7, lines 29-62), submitting entered information to the document component system for selecting document components and assembling selected documents into a document for publication (taught as the posting of a modified document to the system by use of messages and message files, at col. 8, lines 26-47).

Regarding claims 4, 20, and 33, Khan teaches providing users access to authorized individual ordering functions, taught as the use of a user name and password for granting users access privileges to different projects, at col. 5, lines 13-19 and 64-66.

Regarding claims 5, 21, and 34, Khan teaches a plurality of user in-boxes, text authors and reviewers viewing assigned tasks through the in-boxes (taught as message files associated with each document under development, documents being modified and viewed by multiple authors through the use of such in-boxes, at col. 6, lines 21-28 and col. 6-7 lines 58-9), a search and impact analysis interface for searching for components, documents, and previously published documents (taught as the use of a project file directory allowing a user to view documents and components related to a project, at col. 6, lines 1-5), and a rules loading and configuration interface for loading business layer names and rules (taught as the encapsulation

Art Unit: 2173

of data and methods related to document files in a document class, which is inherently loaded by the program, at col. 9-10, lines 63-6).

Regarding claim 6, Khan teaches allowing users to view the impact of revisions to a document through the search and impact analysis interface, taught as the ability of a user to select a document through the interface and view its modifications, at col. 6, lines 6-12.

Regarding claims 7 and 35, Khan teaches the selection of tasks and management of documents and document components through the use of an in-box, taught as using messages and message files to aid in the modification and development documents, at col. 6, lines 21-28 and col. 6-7 lines 58-9.

Regarding claims 11, 24, and 37, Khan teaches users selectively search authorized individual items based upon security access authorization, taught as the ability to modify access privileges of users for different projects, at col. 5, lines 64-66.

Regarding claims 12, 25, and 38, Khan teaches providing a user with search results indicating documents and selected document components, taught as the use of a project file directory allowing a user to view documents and components related to a project, at col. 6, lines 1-5.

Regarding claim 39, Khan teaches creating new users, modifying user profiles, and administering security at col. 5, lines 9-19 and 62-66.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 8-10, 22, 23, and 36-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Khan and Dabney et al (US Patent 6,643,663), hereinafter Dabney.

Regarding claim 8, Khan has been shown *supra* to allow users to manage documents and document components, taught as allowing users to make changes to a document by adding, deleting, or modifying components, at col. 7, lines 29-62, and using messages and message files to aid in the modification and development documents, at col. 6, lines 21-28 and col. 6-7 lines 58-9.

However, Khan fails to explicitly teach allowing users to check assigned documents and document components in and out and approve or reject documents and document components.

Dabney teaches a method for operating a content management system that allows users to receive, edit, and distribute data across a network, similar to the system for developing documents of Khan. Furthermore, Dabney teaches allowing users to check assigned documents and document components in and out (taught as the use of "check in" and "check out" buttons at col. 13, lines 50-63), and approve or reject documents and document components (taught as the approval or rejection of content by a manager having approval rights, at col. 5, lines 35-42).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Khan and Dabney before him at the time the invention was made to modify the document development system of Khan with the "check-in/check-out" and approval systems of

Art Unit: 2173

Dabney in order to obtain a document development system wherein managing users may approve, reject, or check-in and check-out documents.

One would be motivated to make such a combination for the advantage of document security (no other editors may check out the same story at the same time, see Dabney, col. 13, lines 50-52), and managing the content so only appropriate documents are posted (see Dabney, col. 5, lines 39-42).

Regarding claims 9 and 10, Dabney teaches forwarding or passing back approved or rejected documents to an appropriate stage in the workflow process, at col. 5, lines 35-42.

Regarding claims 22, 23, and 36, Dabney teaches allowing users to check assigned documents and document components in and out (taught as the use of "check in" and "check out" buttons at col. 13, lines 50-63), and forwarding or passing back approved or rejected documents to an appropriate stage in the workflow process (see col. 5, lines 35-42).

Regarding claim 37, Khan teaches users selectively search authorized individual items based upon security access authorization, taught as the ability to modify access privileges of users for different projects, at col. 5, lines 64-66.

Regarding claim 38, Khan teaches providing a user with search results indicating documents and selected document components, taught as the use of a project file directory allowing a user to view documents and components related to a project, at col. 6, lines 1-5.

Art Unit: 2173

Regarding claim 39, Khan teaches creating new users, modifying user profiles, and administering security at col. 5, lines 9-19 and 62-66.

Claims 13-15, 26-28, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Khan, Dabney, and Siefert (US Patent 5,721,906).

Regarding claims 13 and 26, Khan and Dabney teach a document specialist interface for receiving new components and revised text (taught as the editor or operator who reviews and edits data stored in a content management system, at col. 6, lines 20-24 of Dabney), and a workflow administration interface for allowing authorized users to perform workflow tasks and view workflow functions (taught as the use of a manager for approving or rejecting documents and their subsequent delivery to a proper location in the workflow, at col. 5, lines 35-42 of Dabney).

However, Khan and Dabney fail to explicitly teach a system administration interface where selected authorized users create new users, modify existing user profiles, and administer security.

Siefert teaches a system for managing resources that allow a user to order delivery of a selected resource and limits access to resources based on authorization. While Khan teaches an interface allowing a general user to create a new account, modify a user profile, and administer security (see Khan, col. 5, lines 5-9, 62-66), Siefert teaches an Administrator authorized to perform all three functions (see col. 19, lines 32-62).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Khan, Dabney, and Siefert before him at the time the invention was made to modify the document development system of Khan and Dabney to include the Administrator of Siefert

Art Unit: 2173

in order to obtain a document development system wherein users and user profiles are managed by an authorized Administrator.

One would be motivated to make such a combination for the advantage of allowing an authorized user to make decisions about security issues and access limitations for users. The function of an Administrator for such things as network accounts and web sites is well known in the art, and would thus be obvious to include for its many advantages.

Regarding claims 14, 27, and 40, Dabney teaches receiving new or revised text in word processor format (taught as the text data of a content management system of col. 6, lines 13-19), converting the word processor format to a mark-up file (taught as the translation of platform code to platform independent code, such as HTML, at col. 8, lines 11-13), and verifying the mark-up file for test and production (taught as the editing and approving of translated data by a web editor, at col. 8, lines 58-60).

Regarding claims 15 and 28, Dabney teaches revising text within a mark-up file through a document specialist interface, taught as the editing of checked out data at col. 13, lines 59-63 and in Fig. 4. Furthermore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include document type definition file editing and schema alterations. Applicant has not disclosed that the use of DTD files or schema files provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with HTML files because HTML allows one to specify the layout and visual characteristics of content, as do DTD files and schemas.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Dabney to obtain the invention as specified in claim 15.

Claims 16, 29, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Khan, Dabney, Siefert, and Okita et al (US Patent 6,225,998), hereinafter Okita.

Khan, Dabney, and Siefert have been shown *supra* to teach initiating specific projects, viewing project status, viewing user in-boxes and in-box status, and load balancing for a particular task (see Dabney, Fig. 11, col. 13, lines 32-63 and col. 5, lines 35-42).

However, Khan, Dabney, and Siefert fail to explicitly teach creating and modifying workflow templates.

Okita teaches a system for displaying a visual representation of transaction flow through a transaction processing system. Furthermore, Okita teaches the creation and modification of workflow templates, at col. 10, lines 32-41 and col. 13, lines 1-8.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Khan, Dabney, Siefert, and Okita before him at the time the invention was made to modify the document development system of Khan, Dabney, and Siefert to include the workflow visualization of Okita in order to obtain a document development system wherein the workflow for developed projects is visualized.

One would be motivated to make such a combination for the advantage of coordinating workflows across distributed environments and reducing application development time. See Okita, col. 1, lines 55-63.

Response to Argument

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 37-39 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's arguments filed 9 December 2004 with respect to claims 1-36 and 37-41 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument with respect to claims 1, 17, and 30, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Thus, when subject to the broadest reasonable interpretation, the examiner contends that Khan discloses an ordering unit for placing document orders, and computer code means for the like, as discussed *supra*.

Similarly, the examiner contends that Khan teaches an interactive publisher allowing users to place document orders interactively, and computer code means for the like, as disclosed in claims 2, 18, and 31, and discussed *supra*.

Regarding claims 3-5, 19-21, and 32-34, page 4 of the Office Action dated 9 September 2004 clearly discusses the claim limitations therein with respect to Khan.

Furthermore, the examiner maintains that Khan discloses a "search and impact analysis interface, users searching for components, documents, and previously published documents through said search and impact analysis interface; and a rules loading and configuration interface, business layer names and rules being loaded through said rules loading and configuration interface".


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Roswell whose telephone number is (571) 272-4055. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 - 6:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached on (571) 272-4048. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Michael Roswell
3/23/2005



JOHN CABECA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER